REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-13, 18-22, 29, and 30 are currently pending in this application. Withdrawn claims 14-17 and 23-25 have been canceled by this reply, without prejudice or disclaimer. Further, claims 11-13 and 20-22 have also been canceled by this reply. Claims 31-40 have been newly added by this reply. Claims 1 and 18 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 18.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claims 11-13 and 20-22, respectively. Accordingly, claims 11-13 and 20-22 have been canceled by this reply. In independent claims also recite that the user URL request is compared with the access allow list and the access deny list to determine which URLs an authenticated user can access.

Further, claims 31-40 have been newly added by this reply. Claims 31-34 are directed toward the message structure associated with the gateway protocol that is used for communications between the receiver/decoder and the gateway. Claims 36-40 are directed toward receiver/decoder authentication and subscriber accounts for log-in and access to internet services via the receiver/decoder and gateway.

Support for the newly added claims may be found, for example, on pages 15-16, and 20-22 of the Specification. Applicant asserts that no new subject matter is added by way of these amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,983,273 ("White"). Claims 11 and 20-21 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 11 and 20-21. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to recite that data output by the receiver/decoder is converted into data that is compliant with the network protocols associated with the gateway interposed between the receiver/decoder and a remote device. The data is converted at a location that is remote from the receiver/decoder. Further, the amended independent claims recite that the network comprises a plurality of remote devices, wherein the converted data is communicated by the gateway to one of the plurality of remote devices as specified in said data, and that is communication channel is established between the receiver/decoder and the specified remote device.

With respect to White, the Examiner admits that White fails to teach or suggest converting data output from the receiver/decoder into data that is compliant with the network protocols associated with the gateway interposed between the receiver/decoder and the remote device (*see* Office Action mailed September 15, 2006, page 8). In view of the above, it is clear that White fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims. Thus,

White fails to support the rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 18. Dependent claims 2-10 and 19 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-13, 22, and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over White and further in view of US Patent No. 6,301,661 ("Shambroom"). Claims 12-13 and 22 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 12, 13, and 22. However, the subject matter of claims 12 and 13 has been incorporated into the independent claims. Thus, to the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that Shambroom discloses the limitations of original claims 12 and 13. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Shambroom relates to providing enhanced security for applications using downloadable executable content (*see* Shambroom, Abstract). The cited portion of Shambroom teaches that client-authenticating information is encoded and provided to a gateway (*see* Shambroom, col. 2, ll. 38-39). The gateway of Shambroom subsequently uses the encoded authentication information to create a parameter value that is used to download executable content by the client. The client then provides the parameter value to an execution server which decodes the encoded client-authenticating information. The decoded client-authenticating information is then used to establish communication with a remote login host, where the gateway is an intermediary component between the client and the remote login host (*see* Shambroom, col. 2, ll. 56-64).

Thus, it appears that the Examiner equates the encoded client-authentication information of Shambroom with the converted data of the present invention. Shambroom discloses that encoding client-authentication information involves making the client-authentication information ASCII encoded or URL encoded (*see* Shambroom, col. 5, ll. 37-44). However, in contrast to the type of encoding disclosing in Shambroom, the present invention converts data to comply with a *network protocol*, as recited in the amended independent claims. A network protocol is a very common term of art that describes the standard communication language for a network component. For example, in the present invention, data may be converted from non-Internet Protocol (IP) data to IP data (*see, e.g.,* Specification, page 5). The encoding disclosed in Shambroom has nothing to do with network protocols. In fact, the client-authentication information of Shambroom is not encoded to comply with any type of protocol associated with the web server to which the encoded client-authenticated information is provided. Rather, the client-authentication information of Shambroom is simply "wrapped" (*i.e.,* encompassed) in some type of encoding scheme, such as URL encoding or ASCII encoding. Applicant asserts that one skilled in the art would not equate such encoding with actual data conversation from one network protocol to another network protocol.

Further, Shambroom is completely silent with respect to a plurality of remote devices that are connected to the network, and that the gateway establishes a connection between *one of the many* remote devices that are connected to the network, based on what is *specified in the converted* data. That is, Shambroom fails to teach or suggest that the *encoded* client-authentication information *specifies* to the gateway to establish a connection to the remote login host, as required by the amended independent claims of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is clear that Shambroom fails to render amended independent claims 1 and 18 obvious. Thus, amended independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable over White and Shambroom, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 29-30 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Dependent claims 31-40 have been newly added by this reply, and are directed toward specifics of the gateway protocol used for communication between the receiver/decoder and the gateway, and the steps performed for a subscriber to access internet services provided by the remote device via the gateway. Dependent claims 31-40, which depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 1 and 18, are patentable over White and Shambroom for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claims.

In addition, both White and Shambroom, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a message structure corresponding to a lower-level gateway protocol as recited in dependent claims 31-34. Further, White and Shambroom, whether considered separately or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest a connection account and a directory account that are linked, where the connection account is used for log-in purposes and the directory account is used to access internet services, as recited in dependent claims 37-40.

Accordingly, favorable consideration of the newly added dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/042001).

Dated: December 4, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

191836_1